

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/992,084	JIANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel S. Metzmaier	1712	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Rejected

(1) Daniel S. Metzmaier.

(3) _____.

(2) Marcella D. Watkins.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 May 2005

Time: ~ 12:30 PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections of record discussed generally.

Claims discussed:

all claims submitted in the After Final Amendment.

Prior art documents discussed:

Zakhidov et al., US 6,261,469.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: discussed the scope of the subject matter that was indicated as allowable in the Final Rejection as directed to the method claims. Discussed the Restriction and election mailed 4/14/2003 and the collapse of the election of species as to the method claims only set forth in paragraph 2 of the Office Action mailed 5/29/2003. Examiner indicated the After Final Amendment would raise new issues requiring further search and consideration after final rejection. The examiner proposed the cancellation of the compositions claims in favor of the allowable method claims. Also, claims 42 and 61 were noted as not further limiting, changes to 30 were proposed to make the claim read more clearly, and the status identifier of claim 41 needed correction. A courtesy copy of said changes was requested by the examiner and graciously provided via fax by applicants to the examiner.